

9 Iyar 5780
May 3, 2020



Shabbos Daf 58

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

1. An *istema* does not have a problem of *sha’atnez*, does not contract *tzaraas*, and a woman cannot go out with an *istema* on Shabbos.

An *istema*, (a scarf that a woman uses to restrain stray hairs from protruding from her head) is not a problem with regard to *sha’atnez*, as it is felt and is not spun, whereas the prohibition of *sha’atnez* is concerning spun threads. Similarly, an *istema* will not contract *tzaraas*, as only a garment of spun fibers can contract *tzaraas*. A woman cannot go out to a public domain with an *istema* on *Shabbos*. According to Rabbi Shimon, although the Chachamim forbade a bride to wear a crown made of expensive metal at her wedding to reflect mourning over the destruction of the Bais HaMikdash, an *istema*, made of fabric, was not incorporated into this decree. (57b – 58a)

2. A slave can go out with an emblem on his neck but is forbidden to go out with an emblem on his clothing.

Shmuel maintains that the *Mishna* that states that a woman cannot go out on *Shabbos* to a public domain with a *kavul* refers to the emblem worn by a slave. The Gemora asks: Did Shmuel indeed say this? But Shmuel himself said that a slave could go out on *Shabbos* with an emblem on his neck, but not an emblem that is on his clothing? The Gemora answers: This is not a difficulty, as that statement refers to an emblem made by his master that he will not remove. If the slave made his own emblem, however, he may not go out with the emblem on *Shabbos*. How have you explained this latter [dictum] of Shmuel? That his master set it upon him! Then why [may he] not [go out] with the emblem on his garment?

— Lest it break off, and he be afraid and fold it [the garment] and put it over his shoulder. This is as Rav Yitzchak bar Yosef, who said in Rabbi Yochanan's name: If one goes out on the *Shabbos* with a folded garment slung over his shoulder, he incurs a chatas-offering. And [this is] as Shmuel said to Rav Chinena bar Shila: No scholar of the house of the Exilarch may go out with a cloak bearing an emblem, except you, because the house of the Exilarch is not particular about you. (58a)

It was stated: Shmuel said: A slave could go out on *Shabbos* with an emblem on his neck, but not an emblem that is on his clothing. The Gemora cites a supporting Baraisa: A slave could go out on *Shabbos* with an emblem on his neck, but not an emblem that is on his clothing. The Gemora asks that this contradicts another Baraisa: A slave may not go out on *Shabbos* with an emblem on his neck, and not with an emblem that is on his clothing. And both this and this (the emblems that he wears on his neck or on his clothing) are susceptible to *tumah*. He may not go out with a bell on his neck, but he may, however, go out with a bell on his clothing. Both this and this (the bells on his neck and the bells on his clothing) are susceptible to *tumah*. An animal may not go out with an emblem around its neck nor with an emblem on its covering, nor with the bell on its covering nor with the bell around its neck, and none of these are susceptible to *tumah*. Shall we say that in the one case his master had set it upon him, while in the other he had set it upon himself? — No. In both cases his master had set it upon him, but one refers to a metal [emblem] while the other refers to a

clay [emblem].¹ And [this is] as Rav Nachman said in Rabbah bar Avuha's name: That about which the master is particular,² one [a slave] may not go out with it; that about which the master is not particular, one may go out with it. Reason too supports this, since it is stated: 'none of these are susceptible to tumah'. Now, if you say [that the reference is to] metal [emblems], it is well; [hence] only these are not susceptible to tumah, but their utensils are. But if you say that we learned of clay [emblems], [it might be asked] are only these not susceptible to defilement, whereas their utensils are? Surely it was taught: Utensils of stone, dung, or earth do not contract tumah either by Biblical or by Rabbinical law. Hence it follows that the reference is to metal [emblems]. This proves it. (58a)

3. Going out with bells

The Master said: '[He may] not [go out] with the bell around his neck, but he may go out with the bell on his garment.' Why not with the bell around his neck; [presumably] 'lest it become detached and he come to carry it: then also in the case of the bell on his garment let us fear that it may become attached and he come to carry it? — The reference here is to one that was woven [sewn] into it. And [this is] in agreement with Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua, who said: Concerning whatever is woven they enacted no prohibition. (58a)

4. A metal vessel used to make sounds is susceptible to tumah.

The Master said: 'An animal may not go out with an emblem around its neck nor with an emblem on its covering, nor with the bell on its covering nor with the

bell around its neck, and none of these are susceptible to tumah.' Now, does an animal's bell not contract tumah? But the following contradicts it: An animal's bell is susceptible to tumah, but a door bell is tahor.³ A door [bell] appointed for an animal[’s use] is susceptible to tumah; an animal [bell] appointed for [fixing] to a door, even if attached to the door and fastened with nails, is susceptible to tumah; for all utensils descend to tumah by intention, but are relieved from their tumah only by a change-effecting act? — There is no difficulty: in the one case [the reference is] where it has a clapper: in the other where it has no clapper.⁴ What will you: if it is a utensil, then even if it has no clapper [it is tamei]; if it is not a utensil, does the clapper make it one? Yes, as Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmeini said in Rabbi Yonasan's name, viz.: How do we know that a metal object which causes sound is susceptible to tumah? Because the Torah states that anything that comes into fire shall be passed through fire and it will become purified. Since the Torah uses the word *davar*, thing, we can interpret the word *davar* to mean *dibbur*, even something that emits a sound must go through fire to be purified, because such a vessel is susceptible to *tumah*. How have you interpreted it? As referring to [a bell] without a clapper! Then consider the middle clause: 'Nor with a bell around his neck, but he may go out with a bell on his garments, and both can contract tumah.' But if it has no clapper, can it become tamei? Surely the following contradicts this: One who fashions a bell for a mortar used to grind spices, for an infant's cradle to lull the baby to sleep, for coverings of textbooks, or for coverings worn by children, the law is as follows: Bells with clappers are susceptible to *tumah*, bells without clappers are not complete vessels and are not susceptible to *tumah*, and bells whose clappers were removed retain their *tumah*. — That is only in the case of

¹ It is shown below that this must refer to a metal emblem; hence even if his master set it upon him he may not go out with it, for should it accidentally snap off the slave would be afraid to leave it in the street on account of its value, but would bring it home, which is forbidden. But the value of a clay emblem is negligible, while if his master set it upon him he is certainly afraid to remove it; hence he may go out with it. Consequently, the prohibition in the Mishnah, which treats of a clay emblem, must refer to one that he set upon himself. Although metal

vessels are susceptible to *tumah*, metal emblems are not susceptible to *tumah*. With regard to earthenware, however, even earthenware vessels are not susceptible to *tumah*.

² On account of its value.

³ The door being part of the house, it is not a utensil, and hence cannot become tamei; the bell, in turn, is part of the door.

⁴ If it has a clapper it is susceptible to tumah as a utensil.



a child, where its purpose is [to produce] sound. But in the case of an adult, it is an ornament for him even without a clapper. (58a – 58b)

5. Bells without clappers

The Master had stated: Bells whose clappers were removed retain their *tumah*. What are they used for? Said Abaye: [They are still utensils,] because an unskilled person can put it back. Rava objected: A bell and its clapper are [counted as] connected. ⁵And should you answer: This is its meaning: Even when they are not connected, they are [counted as] connected, — surely it was taught: A scissors of separate blades and the cutter of a [carpenter's] plane are [counted as] connected in respect of *tumah*, but not in respect of sprinkling. Now we objected: Whichever way you wish to regard this: if they are [counted as] connected, [they should be so] even in respect of sprinkling too; [if they count] not as connected, they should not [be so] even in respect of *tumah* either? And Rabbah answered: By Scriptural law, when in use they are [counted as] connected in respect of both *tumah* and sprinkling; when not in use, they are [counted as] connected in respect of neither *tumah* nor sprinkling. But they [the Rabbis] enacted a preventive measure in respect of *tumah* when they are not in use on account of *tumah* when they are in use; and in respect of sprinkling, when they are in use, on account of when they are not in use!⁶ (58b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Women Cannot Go Out on Shabbos Wearing Jewelry

The Meshech Chochmah quotes Rabbeinu Tam who writes that the Chachamim only prohibited women from going out on *Shabbos* with jewelry and not men. The reason for this prohibition is because the Chachamim were concerned that

⁵ And rank as a single utensil, so that if once becomes tamei the other is too. (This is, of course, when they are together.) Similarly, if one is besprinkled, the other becomes tahor. This shows that when they are separated, each is but a fragment of a utensil, though an unskilled person can replace it, and should therefore be tahor.

women are idle from work on *Shabbos*, and this would lead them to engage in immoral activities, so to prevent this, the Chachamim forbade women from going out with jewelry on *Shabbos*.

Wearing a Jacket on Shabbos Without Inserting the Arms Inside the Sleeves

The *Gemora* states that one who goes out in a public domain with his tallis folded and placed on his shoulders on *Shabbos* is liable a chats.

The Poskim discuss the *halachah* regarding one who goes out on *Shabbos* with a jacket without inserting his arms inside the sleeves.

Shaalos Uteshuvos Divrei Chachamim quotes Rav Elyashiv who rules that although there is room for leniency, the custom is to be stringent and not to go out wearing a jacket with one's arms not inserted in the sleeves.

Shmiras Shabbos Kihilchoso writes that although merely draping a jacket over one's shoulders is considered wearing the garment, one should be stringent in a public domain because the jacket might slip off his shoulders and he will carry four *amos* in a public domain.

Reb Benzion Abba Shaul zt"l, however, allows one to drape a jacket over his shoulder outright.

Reb Benzion Abba Shaul goes further and permits one who is going to immerse in a *mikvah* to wrap a towel around his shoulders and wear the towel in a public domain on *Shabbos*, as this is also considered wearing the towel.

⁶ Now, obviously this must all refer to where the parts are joined, since we compare these utensils when not in use to same when in use. Hence it is implied that when not actually together they do not become tamei even by Rabbinical law, because each is regarded as a fragment, though all unskilled person can join them.